

Chemical. (G) Substituted naphthalene carboxamide.
Use/Import. (G) Colorant for plastics, contained use. Import range: Confidential.

Toxicity Data. Ames test: Negative; CHO test: Negative.
Exposure. Minimal.
Environmental Release/Disposal. 6.3 kg/yr disposed.

P 86-587

Manufacturer. Confidential.

Chemical. (G) Blocked isocyanate homopolymer.

Use/Production. (S) Site-limited and industrial coatings. Prod. range: Confidential.

Toxicity Data. No data submitted.
Exposure. Manufacture: dermal, a total of 10 workers, up to 8 hrs/da.
Environmental Release/Disposal. No release.

P 86-588

Manufacturer. Alcolac Inc.

Chemical. (S) Poly(oxy-1,2-ethandediyl), alpha-(2-methyl-1-oxo-2-propenyl-beta-(dodecyloxy)-.

Use/Production. (S) Aqueous Thickeners. Prod. range: Confidential.

Toxicity Data. No data submitted.
Exposure. Confidential.
Environmental Release/Disposal. 2 to 4 kg/batch released to water. Disposal by POTW and bioponds.

P 86-589

Importer. Confidential.

Chemical. (G) Alkylamine distillation residues.

Use/Import. (S) Industrial stabilizer for polymers in drilling fluids. Import range: Confidential.

Toxicity Data. No data submitted.
Exposure. No data submitted.
Environmental Release/Disposal. No data submitted.

P 86-590

Importer. Confidential.

Chemical. (G) Thermoplastic polyurethane.

Use/Import. (S) Industrial thermoplastic polyurethane for extruded goods. Import range: Confidential.

Toxicity Data. No data submitted.
Exposure. No data submitted.
Environmental Release/Disposal. No data submitted.

P 86-591

Manufacturer. Advanced Glass Systems Corporation.

Chemical. (G) Ionomer polymer (ethylene-methacrylic acid copolymer in salt form).

Use/Production. (S) Site-limited and industrial windshields, bullet resistant

or security glass transparencies, and sloped glazing as laminating resin film between glass layers. Prod. range: 50,000-150,000 kg/yr.

Toxicity Data. No data submitted.

Exposure. Manufacture and processing: a total of 3 workers, up to 8 hrs/da, up to 200 da/yr.

Environmental Release/Disposal. 0.5 to 1 lb/day released. Disposal by POTW.

Dated: February 28, 1986.

Denise Devoe,

Acting Director, Information Management Division.

[FR Doc. 86-4905 Filed 3-6-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

[PF-436; FRL-2969-8]**Pesticide Tolerance Petitions; American Hoechst Corp. et al.****Correction**

In FR Doc. 86-3182, appearing on page 6034, in the issue of Wednesday, February 19, 1986, make the following correction:

On page 6034, second column, under "Initial Filings", the tenth line should read "acid and 2-[4-(2,4-dichloro-".

BILLING CODE 1505-01-M

[OW-FRL-2979-8]**Bacteriological Ambient Water Quality Criteria; Availability**

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of availability of bacteriological ambient water quality criteria document.

SUMMARY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) announces the availability of a bacteriological criteria document. This document provides guidance on ambient indicator bacterial densities which provide protection from risk of gastro-intestinal disease from swimming in bacteriologically contaminated waters. These criteria are intended to form the basis for enforceable State water quality standards and are published pursuant to section 304(a)(1) of the Clean Water Act.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Kent Ballentine, Environmental Protection Agency, Standards Branch (WH-585), Washington, DC 20460, (202) 245-3030.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 304(a)(1) of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1314(a)(1)) requires EPA to publish and periodically update ambient water quality criteria. These criteria are

to reflect the latest scientific knowledge on the identifiable effects of pollutants on public health and welfare, aquatic life, and recreation.

EPA has periodically issued ambient water quality criteria, beginning in 1973 with the publication of the "Blue Book" (*Water Quality Criteria, 1972*). In 1976 the "Red Book" (*Quality Criteria for Water*) was published. On November 28, 1980 (45 FR 79318), EPA announced the publication of 64 individual ambient water quality criteria documents for pollutants listed as toxic under section 307(a)(1) of the Clean Water Act; a criterion for the 65th pollutant, dioxin, was published on February 15, 1984 (49 FR 583). On July 29, 1985 (50 FR 30784), EPA announced the availability of water quality criteria documents for Ammonia, Arsenic, Cadmium, Chlorine, Chromium, Copper, Cyanide, Lead, Mercury, and Guidelines for Deriving Numerical National Water Quality Criteria for the Protection of Aquatic Organisms and Their Uses.

Today EPA is announcing the availability of a water quality criteria document that updates and revises the bacteriological criteria previously published in *Quality Criteria for Water*. The Criteria document entitled, *Bacteriological Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Marine and Fresh Recreational Waters*, may be obtained from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161 (phone number (703) 487-4650). The order number of the NTIS publication is PB 86-158-045 (cost \$9.95). This revision is based on the relationship between swimming-associated gastrointestinal illness and ambient densities of indicator bacteria. The enumeration of the recommended indicators is based on analytical procedures which have recently been approved by the Agency and described in the report, EPA 600/4-85/076. The research upon which the criteria are based was conducted on beaches officially designated for swimming and which had well defined sources of human fecal pollution. EPA concluded from these studies that the indicator organism group recommended in *Quality Criteria for Water*, the fecal coliforms, is inadequate. The EPA studies demonstrated that the enterococci have a far better correlation with swimming associated gastrointestinal illness in both marine and fresh waters than fecal coliform; and that *E. coli*, a specific bacterial species included in the fecal coliform group, has a correlation with gastrointestinal illness in fresh waters equal to

the enterococci, but does not correlate as well in marine waters.

Although the waters and pollution sources, of necessity, were rigorously defined in the research, EPA believes that the criteria can be applied to a broader range of waters and conditions than those defined in the research. The State water quality standards currently use the fecal coliform criterion for waters in which incidental swimming may occur and are classified for primary contact. With the exception of shellfish harvesting waters which must relate to shellfish sanitation guidelines and FDA marketplace requirements, EPA believes that all other waters that are classified for primary contact could benefit from the application of the revised and updated criteria.

In response to the request for comments, EPA received fifty one comments from a wide range of private individuals and organizations. About one-half of the responses were from public health officials, approximately one fourth from treatment plant officials and allied engineering firms and the remaining one-fourth from university and government scientists. The comments from the public health sector were generally supportive of the need for an improved criteria but many felt that the criteria proposed on May 24, 1984 (49 FR 21987) did not reflect accepted levels of protection. Those associated with water pollution treatment generally felt that the proposed change offered no significant improvement over the existing fecal coliform criteria and that careful monitoring of the treatment plants, coupled with sanitary surveys, could provide the adequate protection. Increased cost was also cited as a concern. The comments from scientists pointed out technical factors that should be addressed. In addition to the written responses, verbal comments were expressed by those attending the 13 workshops conducted by EPA on the laboratory methodology. These comments, as would be expected, were of the same tenor as those from other public health officials. The interest shown and the depth of the comments, which are summarized in Appendix A, gives assurance that the general public and those specifically affected have a good understanding of the issues involved. EPA believes that all germane comments have been addressed and that the basic concept upon which the criteria were proposed remains valid. EPA, therefore, recommends that criteria based on *E. coli* and the enterococci organisms be included in State water quality standards for the protection of

primary water contact recreation in place of fecal coliforms or the more general total coliforms.

The recommended densities of indicator organisms (*E. coli* and enterococci), upon which the criteria are based, were calculated to approximate the degree of protection now accepted with the currently used indicator organisms (fecal coliforms). The new criteria recommendations by EPA are:

Fresh water: *E. coli*—not to exceed 126/100ml, or enterococci—not to exceed 33/100ml;

Marine water: enterococci—not to exceed 35/100ml;

These criteria are calculated as the geometric mean of a statistically sufficient number of samples, generally not less than five samples equally spaced over a thirty day period.

Different confidence intervals for these criteria are recommended for four levels of swimming use described in the criteria document.

EPA expects a gradual transition from the fecal coliform criteria to the new indicator bacteria by the States. The transition would first involve the inclusion of the updated criteria in the well defined bathing beach waters where the greatest potential for illness exists. Inclusion of the criteria for other primary contact waters would follow on a priority basis for waters with less swimming or full body contact use. The Agency expects the States to include the criteria for applicable waters as soon as practicable.

Dated: February 21, 1986.

Lawrence J. Jensen,
Assistant Administrator for Water.

Appendix A—Response to Public Comments on the Proposed Bacteriological Ambient Water Quality Criteria

Introduction

On May 24, 1984, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) announced the availability of the proposed bacteriological ambient water quality criteria for public comment. In response the Agency received fifty one letters of comment. Technical aspects of the public comments were reviewed by the Agency's Research and Development staff who performed the research leading to the proposed criteria and those responsible for criteria publication. The Agency herein summarizes those comments and addresses the issues raised.

Comment—A number of public health officials felt that the criteria proposed on May 24, 1984 (FR 21987) was more stringent than that now accepted as

protective of swimmers and should more closely approximate the level recommended in *Quality criteria for Water*.

Response—A recalculation of the data was made to make the final criteria more closely approximate the currently accepted level.

Comment—Most commenters associated with treatment plants offered the opinion that there was general agreement that the current recommended fecal coliform criterion for full body contact recreational waters was based on inadequate and flawed technical data. They further suggested that the proposed indicators suffer from similar flaws.

Response—Because the proposed indicators, as well as the current indicator species, are comprised of non-pathogenic organisms that are consistently found in the feces of warm blooded animals, the basic problems of using surrogates for expected pathogens remain. The problem include: (1) limited epidemiological data to relate indicator organism densities and illness rates, and (2) a variation in the ratio of indicator organisms to pathogens that can be due to the natural variation of illness in human populations (especially prevalent in areas of small populations). The Agency recognizes that problems associated with non-human indicator organisms and differences due to population variations are not completely solved by the proposed criteria but believes that there is sufficient evidence of the epidemiological relationship between illness and indicator species to warrant use of the proposed criteria. The establishment of indicator species is not intended to replace the use of sanitary surveys to determine unsafe conditions caused by improperly treated sewage discharges or other overt contaminating events.

Comment—A number of commenters were critical of various aspects of the experimental data base. Concern was expressed about the adequacy of the definition of the pollution sources in the study area, the variation of illness between the high and low polluted beaches studied, variation in analytical methods, variation in rate of illness and bacterial levels, and lack of studies on a fecal coliform to illness ratio.

Response—The pollution sources for marine beaches were described as diffuse and most were raw sewage. The freshwater beaches were within ¼ miles to five miles from sewage treatment plants outfalls.

In experimental work of a biological nature it is expected that results will vary and reliance on statistical analysis

is needed to ascertain the overall effect. The Agency believes that the data and the analysis warrant the conclusion that the proposed criteria provide a reasonable degree of improvement in relating bacterial indicator densities to the potential of contracting gastrointestinal illness from swimming in polluted waters. It was determined that the relationship correlating fecal coliform and illness was poor relative to that found for enterococci in marine waters and with *E. coli* and enterococci in fresh waters. One commenter indicated that his statistical evaluation of the data showed a good correlation between fecal coliform and swimmers' illness rate at one location. It would be expected that at individual locations a reasonable correlation between fecal coliforms *E. coli* and swimmer illness would occur. However, the EPA studies demonstrated that such correlation does not exist in general, and were not useful for prediction at other locations. Thus, relative to enterococci and *E. coli*, the fecal coliform relationship to swimming-associated disease was not a good one in general and, therefore, fecal coliforms were not considered an appropriate predictor of disease potential.

Comment—One commenter stated that his statistical analysis indicated that the data collected from the swimming beach studies provided no evidence which warrants the replacement of fecal coliform with *E. coli* and enterococci as a measure of the suitability of beach waters for recreational purposes.

Response—It is EPA's judgment that the variations shown by statistical analyses do not affect the overall results of the EPA studies. EPA's studies confirm that even though bacterial parameters are highly variable, proper statistical analysis yields predictable results. However, because the bacterial densities were low and the disease incidence low, occasional anomalous results may occur. Seldom in comparative studies did the control population disease rate exceed the swimmers disease rate.

Comment—A few commenters were concerned that the use of enterococci to monitor water quality would not measure the risk due to contamination by animal feces.

Response—This concern is not considered a serious problem since the two enterococci that grow best on the recommended medium are *S. faecalis* and *S. faecium* which are found together or singly in most animals. Thus, the Agency believes that any risk associated with contact with water contaminated with animal fecal material

will be indexed by the recommended analytical procedures.

Comment—Commenters in areas where non-point animal fecal material runoff was a source of contamination of waters designated for recreational swimming were concerned that runoff associated organisms may cause indicator densities to exceed the recommended criteria.

Response—It has been the Agency's policy to consider waters polluted by animal fecal material to be as hazardous as waters polluted by human fecal contamination. There is, however, no direct evidence that swimming-associated disease, other than leptospirosis, can be traced to animal sources. EPA has ongoing research aimed at determining the impacts on gastroenteritis in humans from non-point source pollution. At the present time, there is no reason to change the Agency's policy.

Comment—Some commenters noted that only gastroenteritis was considered in the data leading to the recommended criteria.

Response—Many other symptomatic illnesses were observed during the Agency's recreational water quality studies, however none showed a functional relationship to bacteriological quality of the water. In general, swimmers appeared to have more eye, ear, and nose infections, respiratory infections and skin infections than nonswimmers, but these differences were seldom statistically significant. Gastrointestinal illnesses, on the other hand, were significantly associated with polluted water and did show a functional relationship to water quality measured with bacterial indicators of fecal contamination. Since non-gastrointestinal illnesses are associated with polluted and non-polluted waters, no form of intervention is available to prevent them. Thus, these illnesses were not addressed. The Agency has supported other research on *otitis externa* in swimmers to evaluate the effect of water quality on this disease and these studies found that there was no association between abnormal ear flora and bacterial indicators of water quality, such as *E. coli*, enterococci and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*.

Comment—Many of those involved in laboratory analysis expressed concern about the length of time needed for the enterococci test.

Response—The method for enumerating enterococci in water samples does require 48 hours to complete. This added time is not considered vital because these criteria are not intended to be used for daily

decisions on closures, but rather more general assessments of the suitability of water quality for the use. The day-to-day evaluation of the suitability of a beach for swimming would be a local health department consideration. Health Departments, for instance, may develop a relationship between rainfall and microbiological quality of water at beaches so that daily decisions could be made on beach closure. These daily decisions must be made with knowledge of the adequacy of impacting sewage plants or other known containment discharges. Timely reports must be made to health authorities on the bypassing of sewage and breakdown of disinfection procedures.

Comment—Most commenters associated with microbiological laboratories indicated that laboratory workers had little or no hands-on experience with the analytical methodology described in the criteria document for *E. coli* and enterococci. Additionally, these commenters were concerned about the formal publication of the methods and the commercial availability of the bacteriological media for the analytical procedures.

Response—Recognizing that many of the State and municipal laboratory staff had no direct experience with the methods, the Agency conducted 13 analytical methodology workshops throughout the United States and Canada during 1985. Over two hundred people associated with laboratories attended these workshops, giving the Agency good assurance that experience with the procedures was well distributed. Additionally the Agency conducted extensive precision and bias testing on the methods in eleven different laboratories to assure users of the procedures that results were accurate and reproducible. The results of the precision and bias testing provide the justification to include the method in the Agency's methods manual. The EPA report, EPA-600/485/076, entitled *Test methods for Escherichia coli and Enterococci in Water By The Membrane Filter Procedure*, outlines the procedures. This document may be obtained from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161, (phone number (703) 487-4650). The order number of the NTIS publication is PB 86-158-052 (cost \$8.95). The Agency also received assurance from a major commercial distributor of bacteriological media that the special media would be placed on the market.

Comment—Some commenters were concerned that turbidity could interfere

with the use of membrane filter methods.

Response—The use of the membrane filter procedures during the course of the EPA recreational water quality studies was not compromised because of turbidity. The MPN procedure for fecal coliform was used during the first year of the studies and abandoned when it became obvious that membrane filter procedures would be adequate.

Comment—Several commenters asked why there was a poor correlation of *E. coli* to illness at marine water beaches.

Response—The poor correlation between swimming-associated gastroenteritis and *E. coli* or fecal coliforms at marine beaches was most likely due to the injurious effects of seawater on coliform bacteria causing high die-off rates. The variability of the response of coliforms to seawater probably is more evident for *E. coli* than for fecal or total coliforms because of the heterogeneity of the fecal or total coliform groups.

Comment—One commenter asked if *Streptococcus faecalis* var. *liquifaciens* species would affect risk determinations, when using enterococci.

Response—The effect of these species on the relationship between water quality and swimming-associated illness apparently is not great, at least with bathing beach waters contaminated by point sources of pollution. Despite the probable presence of *S. faecalis* var. *liquifaciens*, the density of the enterococci indicator group in seawater showed the best relationship to swimming-associated gastroenteritis. This would probably not occur if there was significant interference from this enterococci which is not a species normally inhabiting the intestines of warm blooded animals.

Comment—Concern was expressed that the use of the proposed criteria will result in increased capital and operating expenses for municipal sewage treatment disinfection facilities.

Response—In most cases the risk currently being accepted at swimming beaches will continue to be accepted. Since currently accepted levels of protection will continue EPA does not believe that State adoption of the recommended criteria will generate a widespread need for improved treatment nor a general increase in cost of treatment.

Comment—The point was made that the adoption of the proposed national bacterial bathing beach criteria for *E. coli* and enterococci will result in confusing and overlapping environmental regulations for protecting drinking water and shellfish harvesting waters which are based on fecal

coliform or total coliforms. For example, marine bathing beaches, drinking water supply intakes, and shellfish harvesting areas will be required to comply with two conflicting and overlapping sets of bacterial water quality criteria.

Response—The recommended criteria are aimed at waters classified for recreational swimming. Where the criteria can be advantageously used for this and other ambient water uses, they will replace existing criteria through the States' water quality standards review and revision process. Regulations pertaining to drinking waters and shellfish harvesting are not affected by this criteria recommendation. It is true that some overlap will occur but EPA believes that risk prediction capability of the new indicators justifies their adoption into State Water Quality Standards.

Comment—Several respondents made the point that no evidence was offered to show that *E. coli* and enterococci are indicators of viral enteritis, postulated as the probable cause of most cases of swimming contracted gastroenteritis.

Response—There is no practical way to confirm that enteric viruses were the cause of the illness reported. Based on the best medical and epidemiological information, viruses were assumed to be the most likely causes. The indicator procedure is designed to detect feces associated organisms contained in sewage and cannot differentiate between causes of illness.

Comment—Some commenters indicated that the statistical model used in the criteria document cannot be used to obtain a single value for *E. coli*, enterococci, or any other bacterial indicator systems. Rather the model can only be used to obtain a possible range of values for such use.

Response—EPA recognizes that the criterion is based on a statistical model and that there will be variation around the prediction. These variations should be considered in the monitoring approach.

Comment—A question was raised concerning the nomenclature for *E. coli*. A commenter offered the opinion that the proposed protocol for identifying the bacterial species, *E. coli*, in fresh water is based on counting colonies differentiated on a new membrane filter MF medium (M-TEC) which does not fully define *E. coli*. Therefore, the use of a nomenclature that is species specific is not defensible in the scientific community.

Response—The use of a minimal number of biochemical or physical tests to identify an indicator bacterium species is a well established procedure. Bacteriologists in England have been

doing it for many years. Report No. 71 on Public Health and Medical Subjects. The Bacteriological Examination of Water Supplies, which contains standard methods followed in England states that the indole test carried out on colonies which ferment lactose at 44° C provides a means of distinguishing *E. coli* from other coliforms that ferment lactose at that temperature. Unlike the European bacteriologists who use the term "fecal coli", the British bacteriologists use the term *E. coli*. The nomenclature associated with the mTEC method uses the same reasoning to identify the organisms isolated by this procedure. Colonies that ferment lactose at 44.5° C on the mTEC medium are, in fact, fecal coliforms which generally include *E. coli*, *Klesiella* sp. and sometimes *Enterobacter* and *Citrobacter* species. The latter three species can be differentiated with an *in situ* test for the enzyme urease which they possess. *E. coli* comprise about 87% of the total organism enumerated. Although some few may be erroneously named, the density of this indicator bacterium and its correlation to the rate of swimming-associated illness is not affected.

Comment—Some commenters expressed concern about the implied correlation of *E. coli* and the traditional fecal coliform to risk of illness in the draft criteria document.

Response—In the final document a direct mathematical calculation was used to determine equivalent stringency between fecal coliform and the new indicators. The calculations were based on all data collected by Dufour and Cabelli.

Comment—A question was raised about why current and past fecal coliform data were not used.

Response—Current and past fecal coliform data would not provide meaningful information about potential health effects associated with any particular body of water since this indicator group did not show a direct relationship to swimming associated illness in the EPA recreational water quality studies. *E. coli* densities were shown to be directly related to the swimming associated illness rate in fresh water environments. In general, this means that, relative to swimming associated illness, fecal coliform and *E. coli* are poorly related.

Comment—A number of those associated with laboratories were concerned about increased cost of performing the analysis.

Response—The additional cost for materials alone, i.e., the medium, is negligible. For the *E. coli* method, there is no difference. For the enterococci

method, the cost of the medium is approximately 50% more. The actual time spent assaying each sample is somewhat longer for the new methods because of the need to physically transfer the membrane, but even this part of the procedure does not significantly increase the time needed to complete the test.

Comment—Commenters involved with shellfish harvesting asked if the criteria would be applicable to shellfish harvesting waters.

Response—No, it is not applicable to shellfish waters. However, the Agency is currently examining the relationship between shellfish harvesting water quality and health effects in shellfish consumers. Future plans call for the examination of the relationship between bacterial indicator systems and health effects with water consumption.

[FR Doc. 86-5013 Filed 3-6-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

[FEMA-758-DR]

California; Amendment to Notice of a Major-Disaster Declaration

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice amends the notice of a major disaster for the State of California (FEMA-758-DR), dated February 21, 1986, and related determinations.

DATED: February 27, 1986.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sewall H.E. Johnson, Disaster Assistance Programs, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646-3616.

Notice

The notice of a major disaster for the State of California, dated February 21, 1986, is hereby amended to include the following areas among those areas determined to have been adversely affected by the catastrophe declared a major disaster by the President in his declaration of February 21, 1986:

Calaveras, El Dorado, Mendocino, Placer, Plumas, and San Joaquin Counties for Individual Assistance
Alpine, Amador, Butte, Colusa, Lassen, Sierra, Sutter, Tehama, Tuolumne, and Yolo Counties as adjacent areas for Individual Assistance.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance No. 83.516, Disaster Assistance)

Samuel W. Speck,

Associate Director, State and Local Programs and Support Federal Emergency Management Agency.

[FR Doc. 86-4965 Filed 3-6-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6718-02-M

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Sierra Federal Savings & Loan Association, Denver, CO; Replacement of Conservator With Receiver

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to the authority contained in section 5(d)(6)(D) of the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 1464(d)(6)(D) (1982), the Federal Home Loan Bank Board replaced D. J. Fair as conservator for Sierra Federal Savings and Loan Association, Denver, Colorado ("Association") with the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation as sole receiver for Sierra Federal Savings and Loan Association on February 28, 1986.

Dated: March 4, 1986.

Jeff Sconyers,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 86-5030 Filed 3-6-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6720-01-M

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

Agreement(s) Filed

The Federal Maritime Commission hereby gives notice of the filing of the following agreement(s) pursuant to section 5 of the Shipping Act of 1984.

Interested parties may inspect and obtain a copy of each agreement at the Washington, DC Office of the Federal Maritime Commission, 1100 L Street NW., Room 10325. Interested parties may submit comments on each agreement to the Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, DC 20573, within 10 days after the date of the **Federal Register** in which this notice appears. The requirements for comments are found in section 572.603 of Title 46 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Interested persons should consult this section before communicating with the Commission regarding a pending agreement.

Agreement No.: 203-009735-015.

Title: Steamship Operators Intermodal Committee Agreement.

Parties:

Associated Container Transportation (Australia) Ltd.
Atlantic Container Line G.I.E.
Barber Blue Sea Line

Companhia de Navegacao Maritima
Netumar
Coordinated Caribbean Transport, Inc.

Evergreen Marine Corp., Ltd.
Farrell Lines, Inc.
Flota Mercante Grancolombiana
Columbus Line
Japan Line, Ltd.
Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha, Ltd.
Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc.
A. P. Moller-Maersk Line
Neptune Orient Lines, Ltd.
Nippon Yusen Kaisha, Ltd.
Sea-Land Service, Inc.
South African Marine Corp.
United States Lines, Inc.
Venezuelan Line
Yamashita-Shinnihon Steamship Co., Ltd.

Yang Ming Line
Zim Israel Navigation Co., Ltd.
American President Lines, Ltd.
Mitsui O.S.K. Lines, Ltd.
Seapac Services, Inc.
Showa Lines, Ltd.

Synopsis: The proposed amendment would add Showa Line, Ltd. as a party to the agreement.

Agreement No.: 207-009882-006.

Title: Pacific Australia Direct Line Joint Service Agreement.

Parties:

Associated Container Transportation (Australia) Ltd.
Rederiaktiebolaget Transatlantic

Synopsis: The proposed agreement would extend the date which the parties may give notice of termination of the agreement (in the event a party desires to terminate the agreement as of October 21, 1986) from March 1, 1986 to May 1, 1986.

Dated: March 4, 1986.

By Order of the Federal Maritime Commission.

John Robert Ewers,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 86-5029 Filed 3-6-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6730-01-M

Ocean Freight Forwarder License Applicants

Notice is hereby given that the following persons have filed applications for licenses as ocean freight forwarders with the Federal Maritime Commission pursuant to section 19 of the Shipping Act of 1984 (46 U.S.C. app. 1718) and 46 CFR 510.

Persons knowing of any reason why any of the following persons should not receive a license are requested to contact the Office of Freight Forwarders.